DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 309 696 HE 022 554

AUTHOR Wood, Peter H.; Wood, Jane H.
TITLE Annual Merit Pay and the Evaluation and Improvement of College Faculty: Problems, Solutions, and More Problems.
PUB DATE 17 Feb 88
NOTE 34p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association of Teacher Educators (68th, San Diego, CA, February 17, 1988).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College Faculty; Higher Education; Incentives; *Merit Pay; Motivation; Positive Reinforcement; Questionnaires; Recognition (Achievement); Records (Forms); Teacher Employment; *Teacher Evaluation; Teacher Salaries

ABSTRACT

Merit pay is discussed in three sections, focusing on: (1) an approach to the measurement of the merit of college teachers that avoids much of the subjectivity and potential favoritism that has caused other merit systems to fail, the procedure which evolved over a period of years, and a review of its evolution; (2) results of several surveys of opinions on merit pay; and (3) tentative conclusions. A discussion of the departmental merit system looks at the university and the department, the trial years, and the activity-points merit system. Survey results indicate that most pre-service teachers favor annual merit pay if the evaluation is completely fair. The most common justification for merit pay reflects the positions of equity or fairness and motivation or incentive effects. Forty-two percent of surveyed faculty agreed that they were satisfied with the department's merit system in 1987. The great majority of 85 merit procedures reviewed require faculty to provide documentation of their activities to a committee which allocates merit according to more-or-less clear guidelines. The most common justifications for merit pay systems suggest that annual merit pay would increase equity and productivity. Potential disadvantages include those associated with invalid or very subjective evaluation and inappropriate intrusion of extrinsic rewards into systems dominated by intrinsic rewards and self-directed activities. A copy of the Faculty Merit Reporting Form is attached. Contains 15 references. (SM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED309696

Annual Merit Pay and the Evaluation and Improvement of College Faculty: Problems, Solutions, and More Problems

Peter H. Wood

Jane H. Wood

Bowling Green State University

Bowling Green, Ohio 43403

Abstract

Merit pay for teachers has been advocated by former President Reagan, by President Bush, and by a wide range of individuals and officials. This paper describes an approach involving magnitude scaling and "Delphi" decision procedures that permits an academic unit to produce a consensus upon the "merit" or value of activities and outcomes associated with individual college faculty. The system is objective, predictable and modifiable. The paper also presents the results of a series of surveys of college faculty that indicate that (1) faculty differ considerably in their opinions as to the use and value of most merit procedures; and (2) that there is a general agreement that merit procedures tend to favor research and publication over teaching.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Peter H. Wood

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

HE 022 554

ANNUAL MERIT PAY AND THE EVALUATION AND IMPROVEMENT OF COLLEGE FACULTY: PROBLEMS, SOLUTIONS, AND MORE PROBLEMS

Peter H. Wood

Jane Wood

Bowling Green State University

Bowling Green, Ohio

"Without standards and competition, there can be no champions, no records broken, no excellence in education or any other walk of life." This quote from President Reagan's 1984 State of the Union message reflects one of the President's central, public positions: that the use of standards of performance and the incentives associated with competition will increase productivity and assist in the move toward excellence (Clark and Astuto, 1986). Nearly a year before, on May 21, 1983, President Reagan told graduates at Seton Hall University that "Teachers should be paid and promoted on the basis of their merit and competence ....Hard earned tax dollars should encourage the best....

This paper was presented as a part of the 68th annual meeting of the Association of Teacher Educators, San Diego, February 17, 1988. Dr. Ronald Partin of BGSU was the primary creator of the EDFI Merit System and described the original system in Change. Dr. Robert Reed, Dr. Robert Yonker, Dr. Richard Burke, and Dr. Stewart Berry also were major contributors to the EDFI Merit System.

They have no business rewarding incompetence and mediocrity" (from Calhoun and Protheroe, 1983, p. 3). Four years later, President Reagan again returned to this theme in his reference to the "common sense" of merit pay, "so that good teachers get 'As' as well as apples..." (1988 State of the Union address). Clark and Astuto (1986) believe that these and similar administrative positions are strongly supported by the general public, and recent polls support this belief. The Gallup Polls of 1970 and 1983 asked "Should each teacher be paid on the basis of the quality of his or her work, or should all teachers be paid on a standard scale basis?" (Gallup, G., 1984, 33-34). In 1970, 58% of the public voted that teachers should be paid according to quality of work (with 36% for standard scale and 6% for "don't know"), and in 1983 the results were very similar (61% for quality of work, 31% for standard scale, and 8% for "don't know").

"Merit pay" for publicly paid teachers is supported by the public and by the Federal Administration (and by many state administrations) elected by the public. However, when teachers themselves are asked for their opinions, the results are quite different. Slightly over two-thirds (67%) of elementary teachers and 62% of high school teachers surveyed by Alec Gallup (1974) voted against merit pay for teachers. Similar majorities (74%) of Ohio teachers and 51% of college teachers informally surveyed by P. Wood (in 1986) also voted in opposition to merit pay for teachers -- primarily because they claimed that the evaluation procedures would be unfair or invalid and secondarily because of possible problems with morale.

The Purposes of This Paper

The first part of this paper is intended to describe an approach to the measurement of the "merit" of college teachers that avoids much of the subjectivity and potential favoritism that has caused other merit systems to fail. The procedure evolved over a period of years, and some of this evolution is described. The second part of the paper presents some of the results of several surveys, some still in process, that present various opinions regarding merit pay. A third section presents some tentative conclusions resulting from these surveys and interviews. A companion paper, by Dr. Richard Burke, deals with merit pay from a motivational perspective.

PART I: A DEPARTMENTAL MERIT SYSTEM

Double-digit inflation, public demands for improvement and for accountability, real or potential reductions in resources and in available students, and increased litigation have combined to cause many educational institutions to focus more attention upon their procedures for evaluating and rewarding faculty. In the spring of 1974, the central administration of Bowling Green State University asked college and departmental administrators and faculty to allocate approximately 20% of the next year's annual salary increment in a way that reflected the merit of individual faculty and contract staff. For the previous several years, annual increments (if any) tended to be some hotly-debated combination of a flat sum and a percentage of current salary. Although promotion, tenure, and special awards were all believed to reflect differential merit, the University had not required annual merit decisions for all faculty.

From 1974 until 1979, the central administration supported the 20% merit position while different colleges and departments created and modified their procedures -- sometimes in an attempt to identify and reward merit -- and sometimes to avoid the merit policy while seeming to acceed to administrative demands.

By the spring of 1979, the 20% (of annual increment) merit policy had been generally accepted as a fact of life. Three years later, a new President and an active Board of Trustees increased the merit proportion of the annual increment to 40%. The Faculty Senate, after months of debate, agreed to this policy -- some publicly supporting the belief that merit should be rewarded while others stated that to prolong the discussion might permit a subsequent shift to the 60%, 80% or 100% merit policy believed to be supported by the central administration.

The remainder of Part I of this paper presents a brief description of the merit procedures designed by one department.

The University and the Department

Bowling Green State University is located in Northwestern Ohio and includes approximately 15,000 undergraduate students, 2,000 graduate students, 700 faculty, 350 administrative staff, 1000 classified staff, 7 colleges, and one branch campus. BGSU originated in 1910 as a normal school and has evolved into one of Ohio's several public, regional universities. The University's tradition and its Academic Charter give the primary responsibility for evaluation and salary change to the faculty and chairs of the approximately 45 schools and departments. The Faculty Senate has supported this orientation in its several vetos of suggestions that the college deans or college-level

committees be given direct control over even a small (15%) percentage of the merit-increment pool.

The Department. The Department of Educational Foundations and Inquiry (EDFI) is one of seven departments or schools in the College of Education and Allied Professions. The EDFI Department was formed over fifteen years ago when a very large (100+ faculty) Department of Education was divided into four departments. The 20+ faculty teach graduate and undergraduate courses in educational and child psychology, educational testing and measurement, educational foundations, and in guidance and counseling. Upon formation, the department decided to have only one standing committee (an elected, five-person, Faculty Evaluation Committee) and to make all major decisions as a committee-of-the-whole. Four of the Faculty Evaluation Committee (FEC) are elected for staggered two-year terms and porportionally represent the various professorial ranks in the department. The fifth member is annually appointed by the Department Chair. Both the Department Chair and the department's representative to the College Personnel Committee serve as ex-officio, non-voting members. The FEC is responsible for recommending and implementing procedures related to annual merit increments, reappointment of probationary faculty, promotion, and recommendation for graduate faculty status. Tenure decisions are the responsibility of all tenured faculty while hiring tends to be a responsibility of the departmental subdivisions and of the department itself. All major policy changes must be agreed to by a majority of the department's full-time faculty.

The Trial Years

Previous to 1974, each department chair annually used a five-point scale to rate each faculty member's teaching, research and service. The ratings were stored in the Dean's files, and most faculty appeared unaware of their existence.

Spring, 1974: All Rate All. In order to meet the new request for annual merit pay, all EDFI faculty were asked to use a five-point scale to rate the teaching, research and service of all other EDFI faculty. Each faculty member who was one-half of a standard deviation above the mean (for teaching, research and service) received an extra $100 per dimension. Anyone above this point on a composite rating received an additional $200. The remainder of the annual salary increment was divided between a flat increase of $300 for everyone and a 2½% increase for everyone. The department subsequently voted against the procedure on the grounds that most faculty didn't know enough about their colleagues to rate them. A student ratings form was developed and its three most general questions were intended as one indicator of effective teaching.

Spring, 1975: More Input. Seven criteria were used in 1975. The Faculty Evaluation Committee read self-reported descriptions of the activities of all faculty and independently rated all faculty on teaching, research and service; a student ratings form was employed to produce an additional reflection of teaching; and all faculty were asked to rank their colleagues on teaching, research and service. Again, all faculty were provided with complete access to all personnel files. Faculty in the top 25% on any of the seven criteria received three points per criterion; those falling into the middle 50% range

received two points; and those falling into the bottom quarter received one point. Consequently a "perfect" faculty member would garner 21 points, and a comparatively inactive person would receive seven points. The majority of the available increment was allocated to a 7% cost of living increase; some was used to reduce inequities and to reward those promoted; and the remainder was allocated to merit points valued at $28 each. The ranking system only asked faculty to rank the "best" seven faculty in each dimension and didn't require all to know about the work of all others. This ranking system lasted three years. The rating of the Faculty Evaluation Committee was voted down after one use.

1976-1977. Chair's Opinions Added. The student ratings system and the ranking system continued, and the chair was asked to identify the most meritorious activities performed by faculty during the year. The top nine of the student rated faculty each received $75, the top seven in peer ranked teaching received $30, and the top three (or four) in peer ranked scholarship (or service) also received $30 for each function. Each chair-determined meritorious activity was worth $40. The great majority of the increment was divided among a $420 flat increase, a 4½% increase and rewards to those promoted. The procedure remained the same in 1977, but the dollar values changed.

Spring, 1978. The department voted to award all increments as a percentage of base salary, but meritorious faculty received "Letters of Commendation" based on student ratings, peer rankings and the chair's overall evaluation.

Spring, 1980: Activity Point System = 10%. From 1980 on, all merit was awarded through use of an activity-points system that is

still in use. As in the past, in 1980, the department awarded approximately 10% (or less) of the annual increment to "merit". As the point system became more familiar and the higher administration became more insistent, the full 20% was thrown into the point pool. For the past six years, 40% of the total increment pool has been awarded through use of the point system.

The Activity-Points Merit System

Constraints. As merit awards became more than the awarding of certificates to a few faculty, it became very clear that no single source of information (chair ratings, committee ratings, peer rankings or ratings, student ratings, self-reports) was trusted by the majority of the department, but that departmental acceptance was a prerequisite for implementation. Two studies (Wood, 1977, 1978) tended to highlight some of the weaknesses of the department's previous merit evaluations. For example, peer-ranked "teaching" was more closely correlated with the centrality of office location than with student ratings. By 1980 a majority of the department was tenured, but few were near retirement or were likely to seek positions elsewhere. All would be working together for quite a few years. Any merit system had to be accepted by a majority, and ideally, had to represent the diverse interests and contributions of from 20 to 30 different people. It also was hoped that the merit system might stimulate faculty to improve their performances in areas valued by themselves, by their colleagues, and by their institution.

Step One: Generating Criteria. Each of the 24 faculty (in 1979-80) were mailed a questionnaire which asked them to list activities or products that they believed to represent meritorious "teaching",

"research/scholarship", and "service". At the end of two weeks, the lists were collated to yield 86 separate activities or products.

Step Two: Valuing Activities. A list of the 86 activities or products was distributed, and faculty were asked to value each activity from 0 to 100 points "assuming that a refereed journal article has a value of 20 points." Mean values were computed and rounded to the nearest whole number. Median values would have been used for extremely variable responses.

Step Three: First Use. A merit evaluation checklist was constructed and distributed to faculty. All faculty were asked to note their activities for the previous academic year and sum the resulting points. The Faculty Evaluation Committee examined the resulting forms to resolve inconsistencies and ambiguities. A total of 4,864 points were awarded to all faculty, and these points later were converted into dollar amounts when the total merit increment was allocated to the department. The points received ranged from 34 to 241 with a mean point award of 202.7. Consequently, everyone received some merit money, but the most productive person received seven times as much as the lowest point gainer.

Subsequent years. During each subsequent year, various modifications were suggested by the FEC and accepted by the department. Student ratings of teaching, and the value of books and journal articles were increased in value. An open-ended or "other" category was added to each domain (teaching, research, service) to permit faculty to describe and request points for activities not listed on the form. Some point values were modified, and some activities were added, subdivided or modified. As evidence accumulated that larger, required

undergraduate courses were rated somewhat lower than graduate courses taught by the same teacher, a slight bonus was added to the ratings associated with undergraduate courses.

Advantages and Problems. The system has the advantages of acceptability, flexibility, predictability and modifiability. A 1985 in-house survey of BGSU faculty indicated that EDFI faculty generally were more satisfied with their merit system than were faculty in most other departments. EDFI faculty reported that they knew what activities would earn credit and that activities of interest to them would be valued -- at least to some degree. As new activities were identified and new evidence accumulated, the forms and procedures were modified to reflect these changes. A related advantage involved not having to depend upon the unpredictable nature and potentially demoralizing divisiveness that often is associated with chair, peer or committee ratings.

The major possible disadvantages involve: (1) too great a focus upon quantity instead of quality; (2) a provincialism that occurs when departmental rather than university (or universal) values are incorporated into a merit system; and (3) a potential for a tyranny of the majority. The quality of publications, committee work or advising (Wood and Wood, 1980) could be assessed and built into the system, and various procedures have been tested or considered. However, the current decision is that the effort and introduction of additional, subjective or objective indicators of quality did not justify the required efforts involved. Books by Centra (1979), Miller (1972) and Seldin (1984) provide numerous ratings forms and suggestions for evaluating the quality of many academic activities. Although other departments have

adopted the activity-point system, their ideas and values have not been combined to transcend narrower viewpoints. The activity-point system was designed for use with a single department, but there is nothing to prevent its use by a college, university, or group of institutions.

PART II: SURVEYS AND RESPONSES

Annual merit increments can be allocated to college faculty in a reasonable and relatively fair fashion. The activity-points system described in this paper, Miller's (1972) approach, the contracting system described by Shreeve, Radebaugh, Norby, Goetter, Midgley, Stueckle and de Michele (1985), and the committee-based merit system described by Ezell and Horton (1985) all appear able to allocate merit increments with some degree of validity and satisfaction. The more important question asks if annual merit systems should be introduced to college campuses. The authors of this paper are beginning the initial stages of gathering evidence concerning the advantages and disadvantages associated with annual merit pay.

The Surveys

In early 1986, questionnaires were distributed: to the faculty (N = 87) of one of the seven BGSU colleges (Education); to a convenience sample (N = 74) of local teachers (who were enrolled in evening graduate classes); and to a convenience sample (N = 103) of junior and senior college students enrolled in education classes. Nearly two years later, longer questionnaires were mailed to all tenured and probationary faculty at BGSU (N = 704); other surveys were sent to recently active members (N = 35) of the Midwestern Association of Teachers of Educational Psychology; and, later, to a random sample of 205 chief administrative

officers of teacher education departments, schools and colleges. A current survey has been mailed to a cluster sample of U.S. college/university faculty. A series of informal interviews with local and national college/university faculty also has occurred over the past three years.

The original surveys of convenience samples were intended to: determine general impressions of annual pay; to elicit open-ended responses reflecting beliefs in support of and in opposition to annual merit systems; and to attempt to determine how current and future teachers wanted their teaching to be evaluated. The survey of College of Education faculty (early 1986) and of all BGSU faculty (late 1987) was an attempt to determine general satisfaction with an intact merit system and to gain opinions as to its effects. The (still incomplete) regional and national survey sequence was intended to determine: the degree to which annual merit systems have spread; what general types of procedures are in use; what effects the systems are believed to have; and why the systems were instituted.

Survey Results

The majority (76%) of the pre-service teachers were in favor of annual merit pay "if the evaluation could be accomplished with complete fairness," and nearly 66% still favored merit pay even "if the evaluation system in your school were what it is likely to be and not ideal." The public school teachers were more negative and were similar to those reported in the 1984 Gallup Poll (Gallup, 1984) in that approximately two-thirds (65%) were opposed to the idea of merit pay. The most common justification for merit pay reflected two major positions: 1) Equity or Fairness ("A good job deserves better pay."

"Extra effort and time should be rewarded."); and 2) Motivation or Incentive Effects ("It would encourage teachers to do a better job." "It would motivate teachers to do their very best more of the time."). Nearly half of the pre-service teachers and over three-fourths of the practicing teachers expressed concern about the difficulty of obtaining fair, valid and "non-political" evaluations of teaching. Others mentioned problems such as "hard feelings" and increased administrative control or intrusion associated with merit pay systems. (An argument for merit pay that was regularly suggested by college faculty but less often mentioned by pre-college teachers involved the unfairness of inactive ("deadwood") faculty receiving annual increments of a salary that was already too high.)

The College/University Survey. Forty-two percent of the Education faculty agreed that they were satisfied with their department's merit system in 1987 while fifty-eight percent were generally satisfied nearly two years before. Strong disagreement increased from 10% to 20% in the year's interval. The general, trans-university satisfaction level in late 1987 was 52% satisfied, 17% neutral, 31% dissatisfied. The majority of faculty responding to both surveys (from 58% to 89% depending on the survey and the particular question asked) agreed that merit pay should not be restricted to a limited few but provided to all who have been meritorious. A similar majority (ranging from 55% in 1986 to 63% in 1987) suggested that 100% of the control of merit monies reside at the department level with no money being allocated at the college or university level.

Does Merit Pay Help? The surveys to the Educational Psychology Teachers produced responses indicating that 55% believed that the

incentives associated with annual merit pay were not likely to increase or improve their own research, teaching, advising, or service -- or their institution's major missions or sense of fairness. Slightly over 20% responded that all of these outcomes would be increased or improved, and the remainder were either undecided or believed that only their research and scholarly publications would be improved or increased.

More of the BGSU faculty (35%) agreed that their scholarly productivity would be improved by a 100% merit pay system than agreed that teaching (20%), service (16%), salary fairness (16%), or cooperation (5%) would be improved. Seventy-four percent of the BGSU faculty agreed that merit pay systems tend to favor research (15% undecided, 11% disagreed) but only 7% agreed that merit favored teaching and 9% that it favored service. Most (81%) agreed that different departments should be permitted to establish different criteria for merit.

Early responses to surveys sent to administrators of departments, schools and colleges of education appear to be producing a similar pattern -- with merit pay seen to benefit research more than teaching, service, cooperation or fairness.

How Common Are Merit Systems?

In 1978, Educational Research Service surveyed 11,502 public school systems that enrolled over 99% of the nation's public school students (Porwoll, 1979). Of the 2,848 school systems responding, 4% reported that they had a merit pay or incentive plan in operation and 4.7% more reported considering the institution of such a plan. According to Porwoll (1979), merit pay plans in the larger public school systems peaked in the 1920s at over 20% of schools, stablized "around 10% in

the 1960s and began to decline in the early 1970s" (p. 26). Porwoll also reported that most merit systems rarely lasted more than 5 or 10 years.

Over 75% of the respondents to the survey of Midwestern Educational Psychologists reported that their universities did have annual merit pay systems (all with merit systems were midwestern, moderate to large, state-supported institutions). Only the first set of the wider-ranging, national surveys have been analyzed, but over 50% of the responding teacher education institutions have reported employing some sort of annual or biennial merit system. These systems seem to range from: 1) offers of small development grants to a limited number of faculty (more commonly considered a merit system by smaller colleges and a normal procedure by larger colleges); 2) to specially accelerated merit-related promotions (most common to California public institutions); and 3) to a percentage of the annual increment allocated to differential merit. The percentage of the increment allocated to merit ranges from 15% to 100% -- although some faculty are reporting that a 100% institutional policy is modified by departmental policies that grant some across-the-board increases to all faculty or for some faculty functions (usually teaching).

The great majority of the 85 descriptions of merit procedures read so far require faculty to provide documentation of their activities to a committee which allocates merit according to some more-or-less clear guidelines.

PART III: COMMENTS, OPINIONS, CONCLUSIONS

The most common justifications for merit pay systems suggest that annual merit pay would: (1) increase equity because the more productive

would receive greater rewards; and (2) increase productivity. Potential disadvantages of merit involve: (1) the disadvantages associated with invalid or excessively subjective evaluation; (2) the inappropriate intrusion of extrinsic rewards into systems dominated by intrinsic rewards and self-directed activities; and (3) the dissension and morale problems caused when self-valued contributions are undervalued by peers or administrators. A mini-analysis of one department's scholarly productivity and student ratings (of teachers) indicated that neither the introduction of merit pay nor the increases in merit increments were associated with either gains or reductions of student ratings of teachers or publication rates. Sixty-three percent of the 1986 survey's college faculty reported that the annual merit system neither increased nor decreased scholarly or service performance -- and 76% reported no effect upon teaching performance. The majority of respondants to the other surveys disagreed that merit systems improved or increased research, teaching, service, fairness or cooperation -- although most believed that merit pay favored research over teaching or service.

Although there is no available evidence (as yet) that merit systems help, how do they hurt? According to Cross (1980), an amazing 94% of faculty (at the University of Nebraska) rate themselves as above-average teachers, and "68% rank themselves in the top quarter on teaching performance" (p. 7). Merit systems and faculty evaluation systems that produce contrary evidence (as they must) should lead to resentment rather than improvement and reduced rather than increased morale. Another source of possible dissension lies in the very considerable disagreement that exists among faculty concerning the

merit procedures themselves. No single source of information concerning teaching effectiveness has the confidence of more than 26% of BGSU faculty and virtually every question on the various merit surveys produced large standard deviations and comparatively large proportions of extreme opinions -- in both directions.

Why does the merit pay concept continue to draw administrative and (some) faculty support? One possible answer lies in the general public support (65% in favor, 22% against) for merit pay (G. Gallup, 1984). Boards of trustees and school boards represent a public which approves of merit pay, and these boards transmit public opinion to administrators -- and, less directly, to faculty.

Strictly opinion. Merit pay systems, like the wide-spread use of sudent ratings of the past two decades, are attractive to many decision-makers because they provide at least the appearance of increased equity, productivity and seriousness of purpose. Unfortunately, merit pay and teaching evaluations tend to focus attention upon the unavoidable inequities within any evaluation system while probably not really improving productivity. Improvement most likely requires a greater allocation of administrative and faculty effort and attention. "There is no such thing as a free lunch", and relatively shallow and externally imposed procedural changes are unlikely to substitute for the serious allocation of time and resources.

A second problem lies in a possible dislocation of effort toward those activities that are most open to improvement and most easily measured -- and away from teaching. There is little reason to believe that teachers who are told that they are inadequate will be provided with enough information or assistance to improve subsequent instruction.

One way to improve their merit-associated rewards would be to allocate their energies toward increasing those other activities or products (usually in the research or service categories) that are more easily accomplished, seen, measured and rewarded. How many poor research articles or paper presentations do we really want? Such a shift might be appropriate for a university which wishes to increase research and publication, but very inappropriate for an institution which strongly valued teaching but had trouble measuring it in a valid and/or acceptable manner.

An associated problem lies in the usually unspoken belief that receiving low merit evaluations tends to produce either improvement or early retirement? Low ratings are as likely, or more likely, to produce embittered colleagues who are too discouraged to perform effectively or to attempt to find alternate employment.

All and all, the introduction of annual merit pay is unlikely to provide those gains in productivity or perceived equity that its sponsors wish while possibly causing some reductions in morale -- even in those institutions (many colleges and universities) that already have "career ladders," widely varying pay scales, and a reward system that favors research and publication. More problems should be faced by colleges and universities that have more uniform pay scales, little difference in faculty rank and that value teaching over research or service. The greatest problems should be faced by pre-college, public school systems with relatively low pay scales and few non-teaching obligations.

REFERENCES

Centra, J. A. Determining Faculty Effectiveness. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1979.

Calhoun, F. S., and Protheroe, N. J. Merit pay plans for teachers: Status and descriptions. Arlington, VA: Educational Research Service, Inc., 1983.

Clark, D. L., and Astuto, T. A. The significance and permanence of changes in Federal education policy. Educational Researcher, October 1987, 15, 4-13.

Cross, K. P. "Not Can, but Will College Teaching be Improved?" Reflections, The University of Western Ontario, 1980, 3, 1-11.

Ezell, E. and Horton, G. R. The merit award salary system in a university setting: A case study. The Second Annual College of Education Conference 1985, Bowling Green State University, 1985, 37-47.

Gallup, A. The Gallup Poll of teachers' attitudes toward the public schools. Phi Delta Kappan, October 1984, 97-107.

Gallup, G. The 16th Annual Gallup Poll of the public's attitudes toward the public schools. Phi Delta Kappan, September 1984, 23-38.

Miller, R. I. Evaluating Faculty Performance. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1972.

Partin, R.L. A case study: Evaluating faculty at Bowling Green State University, Change, April 1984, 31, 51-53.

Porwoll, P. J. Merit pay for teachers. Arlington, VA: Educational Research Service, 1979.

Seldin, P. Changing Practices in Faculty Evaluation. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1984.

Shreeve, Radebaugh, Norby, Goetter, Midgley, Stueckle, and de Michele. Contracting for merit pay. College Teaching, 33(4), Fall 1985, 155-158.

Wood, P. The description and evaluation of a college department's faculty rating system. AERA paper, 1977 (ED 142 128, December 1977).

Wood, P. Student and peer rating of college teaching and peer rating of research and service: Four years of departmental evaluation. AERA paper, 1978 (ED 155 218, March 1978).

Wood, P. and Wood, J. Student attitudes toward academic advisement (ED 187 183, October 1980).

OTHER READINGS

Johnson, S. M. Merit pay for teachers: A poor prescription for reform. Harvard Education Review, 1884, 54, 175-185.

Murnane, R. J. and Cohen, D. K. Merit pay and the evaluation problem: Why some merit pay plans fail and a few survive. Harvard Education Review, 1986, 56, 1-17.

The National Commission on Excellence in Education. A Nation at Risk. Washington, D.C.: Author, 1983.

Rice, B. Performance review: The job nobody likes. Psychology Today, 1985, 19(9), 30-36.

United States Department of Education. The nation responds: Recent efforts to improve education. Washington, D.C.: Author, 1984.

EDUCATIONAL FOUNDATIONS AND INQUIRY

Faculty Merit Reporting Form

DIRECTIONS FOR COMPLETING THE EDFI MERIT REPORT FORM

A. General notes: See references to these notes on the merit report form.

Note #1 Grants: Items 9-13 must be received as a result of a competitive process, not awards that are routinely made to programs, colleges, or universities.

Note #2 Paper/Workshop Presentation: The same paper or workshop given multiple times should only be counted once in this section. Subsequent presentations are to be recorded under SERVICE, items 54-55, whichever is appropriate. You must make a professional judgement as to whether sufficient scholarly changes were made in a workshop or presentation to warrant the recording as a new item. Title changes and minor changes do not constitute a new workshop or presentation. The word formal in this section means a paper or workshop prepared in advance of the presentation and presented on some medium in publishable form for scrutiny by colleagues.

Note #3 Annual Editorial: The indicated points for items 27-31 assume a one year editing assignment; thus, if a journal is published four times per year, you receive 25 points if it is a national journal not 100 points (4x25).

Note #4 Professional Service Activities: Professional expertise applied to assist universities, colleges, school systems, departments, agencies, companies and other professional organizations. Do not include "good citizenship" activities performed in the capacity of a private citizen, such as church work, youth group leadership, charity drives and political endeavors.

Note #5 Student Evaluations: Use the mean composite of items 6, 7 and 8 on the Student Evaluation of Teaching form. Add 0.25 to the mean for all undergraduate sections for reporting on this form. Student evaluations from any six sections held during the previous calendar year may be used. Summer school and extension classes may be included as well as regular on-campus classes. (Most evaluations can be verified or retrieved in the department office, if needed).

Note #6 Do not report activities which are performed solely as a part of any administrative assignment. Do not, for example, report service on Advanced Program Council if you are Director of Graduate Studies and on that council only because of your position.

B. General Directions:

1. Possible "double-dipping" such as the following is not permissable:

A. Listing points in more than one category for the same activity. For example: editorial activities and reviewing manuscripts; serving on thesis committee and service to other colleges/departments.

B. Listing points for grants and also for ensuing or consequent activities. For example, receiving a grant for a workshop and conducting the workshop.

NOTE: The following types of activities are <u>not</u> considered as "double-dipping": going to a convention and presenting a paper at the convention; attending a pre-convention workshop and attending the convention.

2. On the blank pages following each of the categories, list meritorious activities not included on the form.

3. On the last page, enter complete documentation for all activities: complete bibliographical documentation for publications and papers; course number, section number and semester for courses; dates and location of conferences; name of committee or council; name of student and title of independent studies . . . No points will be allowed for activities listed that are not documented. Where appropriate make reference to documents included in the accompanying merit document file folder.

4. Any faculty member on an approved leave for one or more semesters during the considered calendar year may request that the mean number of points received in the previous three years be used as the basis for merit distribution. Such a written request should be submitted to the Faculty Evaluation Committee in lieu of this form.

5. In the event that a committee assignment straddles two calendar years, it may be counted in both.

6. The EDFI Graduate Advisory Committee consisting of all faculty holding graduate faculty status is a bona fide committee.

7. Reviewers of manuscripts for journals and/or conventions receive four points for each organization, not each manuscript.

8. Colloquia, symposia, or panel participations without a formal paper count as speeches under item 61.

9. Committee reports normally prepared by the committee chair do not count under items 21 through 23 but are included in the points awarded for chair under items 48 or 49.

10. Large fellowships such as a Fulbright are counted as national grants.

11. Serving as a guest speaker in a class is counted as service to individuals under item 58.

C. Merit Documentation File Folder:

Where documentation is requested beyond the item description summary on the last two forms of the Merit Report Form, each faculty person is requested to submit a file folder of appropriate documents. Please identify this folder with your name and merit documentation file. All items #1-39 in the Research and Scholarly Activities section require a file documentation. Items #52-62 require file documentation in the Service section. Items #70-85 require file documentation in the Teaching section of the merit report form.

1. Confidential Reports Documentation: If requested documentation is considered confidential, this faculty person may request a confidential review statement from the FEC chair and the EDFI chair by presenting the confidential file to either the FEC or EDFI chair. These two chairs will then assess the document and prepare a statement as to the nature of the document to be included in the requesting faculty person's merit documentation file instead of the confidential document.

2. The FEC will consider alternate documentation upon specific written request by faculty lacking the specific requested documentation as noted on the merit report form. Any evidence that an activity, award, service, etc. was completed will be accepted for consideration by FEC. It will be assumed, however, that publications, written reports, awards, citations, editing, theses/dissertation advising, student evaluations, etc. must by nature exist in printed form. Secondly, it is assumed that presentations before formal organizations are always acknowledged in letter and printed program and that this is usually the case for informal organizations as well. And last it is assumed that any professional consulting, assessment, or related activities can be documented by written requests for assistance, acknowledgement for services rendered, reports and recommendations formulated, and/or minimally person/organization requesting services and a brief description of these services and dates even under the most confidential and/or informal professional service circumstances.

8/18

Revised 2/88

EDFI Merit Report Form
198_ Calendar Year

Name_____

RESEARCH AND SCHOLARLY ACTIVITY

Publication (formal copy of publication must be provided):

(1) Book, professional — No.___ @100 ea. = _____

(2) Book, professional (new edition) — No.___ @ 30 ea. = _____

(3) Book, professional (author of chapter) — No.___ @ 30 ea. = _____

(4) Monograph — No.___ @ 30 ea. = _____

(5) Journal article, refereed — No.___ @ 25 ea. = _____

(6) Journal article, non-refereed (ERIC, RIE) — No.___ @ 15 ea. = _____

(7) Article reprint or abstracted: previously published — No.___ @ 5 ea. = _____

(8) Media/Book Review — No.___ @ 5 ea. = _____

Competitive Grants Received (provide approved proposal and/or official award notice, see Note #1):

(9) Outside BGSU - more than $1,000 — No.___ @ 25 ea. = _____

(10) Outside BGSU - more than $1,000 (denied) — No.___ @ 5 ea. = _____

(11) Outside BGSU - less than $1,000 — No.___ @ 10 ea. = _____

(12) Annual FRC Grant/Award — No.___ @ 5 ea. = _____

(13) Other BGSU support grants — No.___ @ 1 ea. = _____

Formal Paper or Workshop Presentation (provide copy of paper, see Note #2):

(14) National — No.___ @ 15 ea. = _____

(15) Regional or State — No.___ @ 10 ea. = _____

(16) Local — No.___ @ 5 ea. = _____

Panel Member, Discussant, Respondent, Critic:

(17) National — No.___ @ 6 ea. = _____

(18) Regional or State — No.___ @ 4 ea. = _____

(19) Local — No.___ @ 2 ea. = _____

Media Development (provide copy of publication notice or actual published product):

(20) Commercially distributed No.___ @ 15 ea. = _____

Development/Evaluation Written Report (provide copy of formal report and request for report):

(21) In-house, Department or College No.___ @ 5 ea. = _____

(22) Agency, school, business No.___ @ 8 ea. = _____

(23) Externally funded project development/eval. No.___ @ 10 ea. = _____

Research/Scholarship/Fellowship/Special Award (provide copy of official award notice):

(24) In-house, department or program competition No.___ @ 5 ea. = _____

(25) College-wide based competition No.___ @ 10 ea. = _____

(26) University or broader based competition No.___ @ 15 ea. = _____

Annual Editorial Activities (provide copy journal, newsletter, and/or letter of acknowledgement, see Note #3):

(27) Book, professional No.___ @ 30 ea. = _____

(28) National journal No.___ @ 25 ea. = _____

(29) Regional or State journal No.___ @ 15 ea. = _____

(30) Local or University publication No.___ @ 5 ea. = _____

(31) Newsletter No.___ @ 5 ea. = _____

Reviewer (provide copy of task assignment, identify book, manuscript, or grant award notice):

(32) Book manuscript review for publisher No.___ @ 5 ea. = _____

(33) Manuscripts for journal No.___ @ 3 ea. = _____

(34) Reader for professional conference No.___ @ 3 ea. = _____

(35) Grant proposals No.___ @ 3 pt. = _____

Professional Conferences or Workshops Attended (provide copy of accepted registration #33, copy of program listing for #34 & 35):

(36) National, Regional, or State No.___ @ 3 pt. = _____

(37) Local (3 hours minimum duration) No.___ @ 1 ea. = _____

(38) Local colloquium (five points maximum) No.___ @ 1 ea. = _____

Other Scholarly Activities

(39) List any other activities that you consider research or scholarship. Include a short description and the number of points you consider each to be worth.

Activity	No. of Pts.

Total Points for Research and Scholarly Activities = _____

SERVICE

Committees and Councils (identify each committee and/or organization with full title spelled out):

(40) Department, College, University Standing — No.____ @ 4 ea. = _____

(41) Department, College, University Ad Hoc — No.____ @ 2 ea. = _____

(42) Local membership Standing — No.____ @ 4 ea. = _____

(43) Local membership Ad Hoc — No.____ @ 2 ea. = _____

(44) State or Regional Standing — No.____ @ 6 ea. = _____

(45) State or Regional Ad Hoc — No.____ @ 3 ea. = _____

(46) National Standing — No.____ @ 8 ea. = _____

(47) National Ad Hoc — No.____ @ 4 ea. = _____

(48) Committee Chair Standing — No.____ @ 2 ea. = _____

(49) Committee Chair Ad Hoc — No.____ @ 1 ea. = _____

(50) Committee secretary — No.____ @ 1 ea. = _____

(51) Area Coordinator — No.____ @ 4 ea. = _____

Professional Service Activities (requesting organization/individual report or description and dates to be provided, see Note #4):

(52) Instructional/Program development, one time — No.____ @ 3 ea. = _____

(53) Instructional/Program development, over extended time — No.____ @ 6 ea. = _____

(54) Consulting, one time formal arrangement — No.____ @ 3 ea. = _____

(55) Consulting, over extended time formal arrangement — No.____ @ 6 ea. = _____

(56) Other services, one time — No.____ @ 3 ea. = _____

(57) Other services, over extended time — No.____ @ 6 ea. = _____

(58) Service to individuals (identify) other than students in your classes of an instructional or research nature. Include here any one-time instructional assignment such as Comp. Exam Seminar. (ten maximum) — No.____ @ 1 ea. = _____

Other Service Activities (provide copy of award notice, program listing, or service request):

(59) Special award/citation (local, program, dept.) No.____ @ 5 ea. = _____

(60) Special award/citation (college, regional) No.____ @ 10 ea. = _____

(61) Speaker for local organization No.____ @ 3 ea. = _____

(62) List any other activities that you consider service. Include a short description and the number of points you consider each to be worth.

Activity	No. of Pts.

Total Points for Service Activities = _____

TEACHING

Adviser (please identify the academic program advising for)

(63) 1-10 students 4 pts. = _____

(64) 11-19 students 6 pts. = _____

(65) 20 or more students 8 pts. = _____

Supervision (please list names of students involved)

(66) Thesis committee, completed No.____ @ 4 ea. = _____

(67) Dissertation committee, completed No.____ @ 5 ea. = _____

(68) Committee chair, completed No.____ @ 4 ea. = _____

Independent Studies Supervised (please identify section numbers and credit hours students registered for)

(69) 1-10 students (ten maximum) No.____ @ 1 ea. = _____

Student Evaluations (see Note #5)

(70) Section mean 6.00 or greater No.____ @ 16 ea. = _____

(71) Section mean 5.75 - 5.99 No.____ @ 14 ea. = _____

(72) Section mean 5.50 - 5.74 No.____ @ 12 ea. = _____

(73) Section mean 5.25 - 5.49 No.____ @ 10 ea. = _____

(74) Section mean 5.00 - 5.24 No.____ @ 8 ea. = _____

(75) Section mean 4.75 - 4.99 No.____ @ 6 ea. = _____

(76) Section mean 4.50 - 4.74 No.____ @ 4 ea. = _____

(77) Section mean 4.25 - 4.49 No.____ @ 2 ea. = _____

(78) Section mean 4.00 - 4.24 No.____ @ 1 ea. = _____

Curriculum Development (copy course proposal or description and title of project)

(79) Course proposal implemented No.____ @ 10 ea. = _____

(80) Program/project coordinator No.____ @ 5 ea. = _____

(81) Program/project coordinator (funded project) No.____ @ 10 ea. = _____

Other Teaching Activities (provide copy of official award notice)

(82) Special award/citation (dept., program, not FEC awards) No.____ @ 5 ea. = _____

(83) Special award/citation (college-wide award) No.____ @ 10 ea. = _____

Name_____ Calendar Year _____

- -

On each of the following lines, indicate the item number and a short description of each activity that you used to gain merit points on the Activity Reporting Form. Provide complete documentation when possible or make reference to documentation in your accompanying merit file folder. For example: include course number, section number, and mean ratings for each student evaluation; provide complete bibliographical documentation for books, articles, papers,...; list student names for advisees; conference date and location. Please attempt to list all activities that fall under one item number together and to order item numbers consecutively.

Item Number	Description of Activity
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

8/18

(84) Special award/citation (university or broader award) No.____ @ 15 ea. = _____

(85) List any other activities that you consider teaching. Include a short description and the number of points you consider each to be worth.

Activity	No. of Pts.

Total Points for Teaching Activities = _____